

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The water erosion rate is <= T.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

All non-traffic areas are vegetated.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Wind Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The wind erosion rate is <= T.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

All non-traffic areas are vegetated.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Classic Gully Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site. Assessment level: For shorelines and water conveyance channels; banks are stable or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND if bank erosion is present, it is beyond the client's control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND for streambanks, SVAP2 bank condition element score > 5.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic streambanks/shorelines, all streambanks/shorelines on the operation show few signs of erosion or bank failure. Each is stable and protected with natural materials.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land**Soil Quality Degradation****Compaction****Planning Criteria**

Screening level: Soil compaction is not a problem AND activities do not cause soil compaction problems. Assessment level: Compaction is managed to meet client's production and management objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Soil compaction is limited to roads and landings. Tree root growth is not impeded. No more than 15 percent of the forested area is devoted to roads, trails, and landings.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Water Quality Degradation

Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excessive Sediment in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10% AND classic gullies are not present AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND the SVAP2 - bank condition ≥ 5 AND the livestock and vehicle water crossings are stable AND The water erosion rate is $\leq T$ AND wind erosion rate is $\leq T$.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

All temporary or permanent rills and gullies are stabilized. All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Air Quality Impacts

Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) and PM Precursors

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Activities are not present that contribute to agricultural source PM or PM precursor emissions AND episodes or complaints of emissions of PM (dust, smoke, exhaust, etc.), or chemical drift have not occurred. PM producing activity examples are: Prescribed Burn is conducted, Travel ways unpaved or treated with binding agents, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, Pesticides are applied, Fertilization (manure/ commercial), CAFO/manure management). Assessment level: PM and PM Precursor emissions are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Dust is controlled on all non-vegetated, unpaved travel ways.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Degraded Plant Condition

Inadequate Structure and Composition

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant communities support the intended land use and desired ecological functions. Assessment level: Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The current plants provide the desired habitat structure and composition.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure. Assessment level: Pest damage to plants are below economic or environmental thresholds or client-identified criteria AND plant pests, including noxious and invasive species are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Invasive and noxious weeds are controlled or not present.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, AND - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Existing plants provide food for the chosen declining, threatened, or endangered wildlife species <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Plant growth provides cover/shelter that benefits threatened, endangered, or declining wildlife species. <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Yes ☐ No ☐

Inadequate Habitat - Water

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR water is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Access to water is at the right height, depth and time of year for wildlife species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the chosen wildlife species. <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1_IN - NIPF Associated Ag Land

Inefficient Energy Use

Equipment and Facilities

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.

Yes ☐ No ☐